

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/060,088	01/30/2002	Gary P. Belford	7170-01627	6425
759	90 10/20/2003		EXAM	INER
Brinkley, McNerney, Morgan Solomon & Tatum, LLP			FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
New River Cent Suite 1800	er		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
200 East Las Olas Blvd.			3751	
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301			DATE MAILED: 10/20/2002	3
				•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

;•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/060,088	BELFORD, GARY P.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert M. Fetsuga	3751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 16 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appetexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of		C. A. of all and a bid an object to be an				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the state of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THITTEN THE ON WHICH THE PETITION AND THE ON WHICH THE PETITION AND THE PETI	f the final rejection.  FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  36(a) and the appropriate extension fee afee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b</li></ol>	ecause:					
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2 and 4-15.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a) □ approved or b) □ disap	proved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	Ped	Robert M. Fetsuga Primary Examiner				
		Art Unit: 3751				

706.07.



Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's admendment filed September 29, 2003 seeks to further prosecute finally rejected claims. As the proposed amendments would change claim scope, new issues would be raised by entry thereof. Applicant has not been prematurley cut off from prosecution since the prior art rejections in both the first and final Office actions are based upon the same reference. See MPEP